

REMARKS:

Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the Application.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-9, 12-13, 15-16, 18-19, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanley in view of Hartley, Hochstein and/or Koehler.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the references above in further view of Parker (1,559,451).

Claims 5,7,14, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the references above in further view of Kish (5,793,062).

Claims 10-11, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the references above in further view of Singer.

No claims were allowed.

Examiner objected to the Drawings.

Examiner objected to the Specification, specifically the ordering of sections.

Applicant has amended the Specification as suggested by Examiner and has amended the claims to reflect what is depicted in the drawings. Specifically, the claims now identify the “secondary” and “dissipating” heat sinks as the same sink. The dissipating sink is the secondary heat sink with added geometry to aid in heat dissipation. Should further drawing corrections be needed, Applicant requests Examiner contact his new attorney by telephone to resolve such issues.

REGARDING EXAMINER’S §103 OBJECTIONS BASED ON SINGER:

Applicant submits that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the

art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure.

Applicant has eliminated GaN from the Markush group and has placed the remaining Markush limitation in the independent claims 1, 12 and 22. As such, the claims now are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the prior art. The previous Markush claims and the claims directed to epitaxial structure (10, 11, 20, and 21) have been cancelled as being moot in light of the present Amendment.

Applicant submits that Claims 1-9, 12-19, and 22 are now clearly allowable over the prior art and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of these Claims and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: April 22, 2007

/GEDobbinEsq/
Geoffrey E. Dobbin
Patent Attorney, # 42,490
4278 S 6220 W
West Valley City, UT 84124-6501
(801) 969-6609 (voice)
(801) 349-2453 (fax)
9:00 am – 5:00 pm Mountain Time